

REMARKS

In the Office Action under reply, claims 15-23 were rejected for obviousness-type double patenting. These claims have been canceled, subject to being re-submitted in a continuing application. Accordingly, this rejection of the claims is moot.

The Examiner found the subject matter of claims 25-30 and 33-38 to be allowable. The subject matter of claim 25 has been added to claim 24 and, as a result, claim 24 now is in condition for allowance. It should be noted that the following recitation of claim 25 was not inserted into claim 24 because this recitation had been included in claim 24 ab initio:

“said second terminal is operably connectable to said multi-purpose cable selected from the group consisting of said UTP cable and said stand-alone cable.”

Likewise, the subject matter of claims 33 has been added to claim 32 and, as a result, claim 32 now is in condition for allowance. Here too, the first recitation in claim 33 has not been inserted into claim 32 because this recitation had been included in claim 32 ab initio.

Claims 26 and 34 are amended to improve their claim dependencies.

This amendment is made simply to speed up the examination process. It is submitted that the claims, as previously presented, were patentable over the prior art. Hence, these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 USC 112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 USC sections 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made expedite the examination of this application.

Claims 24, 26-32 and 34-39 remain in this application and are in condition for allowance.

An early notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By


William S. Frommer

Reg. No. 25,506

(212) 588-0800